Myth criticism of Sixteenth Century Telugu Kavyas

(An English paraphrasing of PhD Thesis by Dr Nagaraj Paturi, submitted in Telugu to the University of Hyderabad, 1998.)

Contents in detail

Part 1 : Theory

Chapter One: Inroduction

Need for a myth criticism of Telugu Literature

(Introduction: Review of Literature-I, problem statement, methodology and plan of dissertation) 1-75 (75 pages)

1.1. Introduction: 5 pages (1-5)

1.1.1. Myth-centrality of classical Telugu literature;

1.1.2. Mahabharata and Ramayana are also 'Purāṇakathā's only; (arguments)

1.1.3. 'Purāṇa' Vs 'Purāṇakathā'

1.2. 'Purāṇakathā'- myth: a comparison, 'Purāṇakathā' as the Indian/Telugu word for 'myth': 5 pages (5-9)

1.2.1. Colonial time usage of the word 'Indian mythology'

1.2.2. Comparability of Greco-roman and Indian mythology and their cultural backgrounds

1.2.3. 'mythomania' of renaissance Europe

1.2.4. Myth as the past in Christian Europe and as the past and the present in India

1.3. Search for the source of the eternal pull (towards myth): 3 pages (9-11)

Common classical heritage attitude towards myth as an explanation for the pull: similarities and differences in western and Indian heritage attitudes.

1.4. Origin of the theories (of myth): one page (11)

Search beyond 'heritage theory'

1.5. Early theories: 12 pages (12-23)

1.5.1. Anti-anti-myth: pejorative usage of the word 'myth'

1.5.2. Vico's approach : Symbolic narratives with factual historical foundation

1.5.3. Romanticist interest: Schelling's theory, extension from Vico

1.5.4. Ernst Cassirer: 'Philosophy of symbolic forms': Details of his myth-theory

1.6. Anthropological theories: 3 pages (24-26)

1.6.1. Focus on rituals: Nature imitation in rituals, rituals to myths: James Frazer

1.6.2. Rituals as enactment of myths: Jane Harrison, Bronislaw Malinowski

1.7. Psychological theories: 7 pages (26- 32)

1.7.1. Common psychoanalytical foundations

1.7.2. Freud's special views

1.7.3. Jung's theory : details

Conclusion of early theories: Impact of the theories on literature and literary criticism

1.8. Origin of myth-criticism: 15 pages (32-46)

1.8.1. Frazer's impact on literary criticism

1.8.2. Freud's literary criticism

1.8.3. Jung's literary criticism: Psychological, Visionary, Archetypes etc.

1.8.4. Archetypal criticism as myth criticism, its application to modern literature: Joseph Campbell: 'monomyth'

1.8.5. myth-ritual approach to modern literature did not take off.

1.8.6. Myth critics: Formalists- Affectivists classification.

1.8.7. Richard Chase: his affectivism: 'manna'

1.8.8. Northrop Frye: his formalism:

- Phases of Symbol : Motif, Sign, Image, Archetype and Monad
- Allegory: Allegory in general and Allegory in Frye's theory
- Metaphor : Extending metaphorical understanding towards archetype and myth
- Imagery based genre-analysis; Seasons based analysis of genres etc.

- Application of Frye's approach to Indian/Telugu literature : Merits and limitations

1.9. Indian Literature- theories of Purāṇakathā : 10 pages (46-55)

1.9.1. Pejorative attitude towards Purāṇakathā

1.9.2. Response through creative writing: no theories

1.9.3. ' Indian renaissance' : Attitudes towards Purāṇakathā in Swami Dayananda Saraswathi, Sri Aurobindo, Theosophical society : 'Master' Ekkirala Krishnamacharyulu etc.

1.9.4. 'rahasyārthaprakāśa' cōmentaries on Purāṇakathā : kunḍalinī yōga, tantra interpretations: Gunturu Seshendra Sharma and others.

1.9.5. Damage to literary understanding in the absence of proper myth-interpretation; examples; limitations of 'rahasyārthaprakāśa'- cōmentaries and need for a new 'scientific' myth-criticism in Indian terms.

1.10. Methodology : This is a folk-classical continuum perspective. : 20 pages (56-75)

1.10.1. Non-classical and classical myths, their narrations and enactments in rituals prevalent in Telugu/Indian folk literature and folk-culture.

1.10.2. Continuities between the 'elite' and the folk aspects of culture as a distinct feature of Indian society; scope for viewing Purāṇakathā from folkloristic understandings such as myth-ritual relations.

1.10.3. Viewing classical literature as part of life and culture of people and cultural anthropological understanding of classical literature.

1.10.4. Studying classical literature using a folkloristic outlook rather than looking for folklore elements in the content of classical literature: Frye's endorsement to this view

1.10.5. Experiencing the sacred in folk-culture as folk 'bhakti' and absence of break between myth and ritual in Indian 'elite' culture as a basis for applicability of folk-cultural understanding to the study of Purāṇakathā.

1.10.6. Usefulness of archetypal outlook for the identification of different folk-divinities as one and identification of the folk –divinities with the classical ones

1.10.7. Usefulness of archetypal outlook in understanding the folk-legends about classical authors

1.10.8. Mircea Eliade's application of archetypal outlook to Indian myth –concepts such as cyclic time.

1.10.9. Usefulness of archetypal outlook in understanding the legend-myth continuities and spirit-possessions of the spirits from the legends in India

1.10.10. Application of archetypal outlook to Telugu in the past and need for more.

Part I : Theory

Chapter Two: Myth criticism in Indian terms: philosophical aspect

76-149 (74 pages)

2.1. Introduction 76-77 (2 pages)

Need for an Indian version of the myth-theory

2.2. upabṛṁhaṇa : 'elaboration' /translation: narrative translation of narrative and non-narrative content 78-85 (8 pages)

2.2.1. The fifth veda concept : Continuity and unity between the vedas and purāṇas; . itihāsa and purāṇas as (a) Classification-remainder and/or (b) Commoner-friendly version of the vedas

2.2.2. Examples of vēda- purāṇa equivalences, 'same archetype' as the source of equivalence

- Vedic gods and puranic gods : archetypal equivalences
- Vedic Vṛtrāsuravadha and gāyatrī as the 'prototypes' and 'archetypes' of demon-killing myths and creation myths in purāṇas
- Vedic rituals and purāṇic rituals : archetypal similarities

2.3. parōkṣatā : indirectness 85-87 (2.5 pages)

2.3.1. 'parokśapriyā vai iva hi dēvāh' – Brahmanas and Aranyakas

2.3.2. 'myth – a different world to be understood differently' - Matsyamahapurana

2.4. prathamatā: being a 'model' ('tāni dharmāṇi prathamānyāsan') ... : ritual as imitation /emulation (of nature) 87-101 (14 pages)

2.4.1. yajña by humans as imitation of yajña by the gods (by the nature forces)

2.4.2. yajña inside human body as the model to understand the yajña in the 'body' of the 'cosmic person'

2.4.3. Follow the nature's yajña-driven 'cycle' – Bhagavadgita

2.4.4. Sun as yajña and yajña by humans as imitation of Sun

2.4.5. Sun as aśvamēdha, tapas its imitation- Brihadaranyaka Upanishad

2.4.6. Mircea Eliade's 'regeneration of time' and regeneration rituals in different world cultures

2.4.7. Sun as sāvitrī , the fertility power, Sun-worship (e.g. the sandhyāvandanam-ritual) as fertility/creative power-worship

2.4.8. Flower-festivals in Indian culture as fertility worshipping rituals and imitations of 'flowering'/'sprouting' in nature

2.5. maṁtra –taṁtra : enactment: rituals as enactments of myths 101-107 (16 pages)

2.5.1. Tantra- its origin - various theories

2.5.3. Roots of Tantra in sānkhya philosophy, sphōṭa philosophy, concepts of kāla etc.

2.5.4. Folk- cultural connection of Tantra

2.5.5. Traditional Indian myth-interpretations being Tantric, esoteric school of myth-interpretation, 'symbolism' view being central to Tantra.

2.5.6. Tantra's notion as enactment/implementation of Mantra: similarities with myth-ritual relation

2.5.7. New meanings for old terms: Mantra as equivalent for myth, Tantra for ritual, Yantra for mythography

2.6. myth-origin: apauruṣēyatva, maṁtradarśana, śruti : 'impersonality', 'seeing'(the myth), 'hearing' (the myth) 107-113 (6pages)

2.6.1. Romanticist philosophers' theories of myth-origin: mythical state of consciousness

2.6.2. apauruṣēyatva, maṁtradarśana, śruti

2.6.3. Impersonality of poetry in English literary criticism: Before Frye, in Frye and impersonality of myth in Cassirer and others

2.6.4. kavi, rishi and brahmarshi: descriptions of emergence of kavitva, mantra etc.

2.7. avibhāga-pravibhāga : indistinct (unconscious)-distinct (conscious) states of mind and myth 113-121 (11 pages)

2.7.1. Concepts of ‘avibhāga’ (unconscious), ‘svapna’ (dream) and ‘liṅga’ (symbol) in the description of mantradars’ana in Bhartrihari’s vākyapadīyam

2.7.2. Evidences for the meanings ‘unconscious’ and ‘conscious’ for the words ‘avibhāga’ and ‘pravibhāga’ in Bhartrihari’s vākyapadīyam

2.7.3. purāṇakathā too requires a different state of consciousness

2.7.4. Myth: To be protected since cannot be created

2.7.5. brahmarṣi of the Vedic tradition Versus ‘primitive’ myth-originator of the modern studies.

2.8. ādhibhautika to ādhidaivika : nature (‘natural’/physical)-level and spirit(‘super-natural’)-level (meanings of myth) 121-134 (13 pages)

2.8.1. Nature-worship: Nature elements as gods; Govardhan giri episode; divinities as nature in Sanskrit poetry, ancient Indian sculptures etc.

2.8.2. Maxmuller’s nature myths, ‘eclipse of solar mythology’ ; Indian critique of Maxmuller’s approach

2.8.3. adhidēvatā, abhimānī dēvatā, ‘presiding deity/spirit of a tree’ ; spirits that pervade spaces, that can be invoked into spaces, objects and persons, nature myth view as textualist and spirit view as fieldwork-based.

2.8.4. sōma not just moon, agni not just fire

2.8.5. The terms adhibhūta, adhidaiva in Bhagavadgita.

2.8.6. prakṛ̥ti and puruṣa of sānkhya, adhibhūta, adhidaiva, Cassirer’s ‘configurations of consciousness’ , forms of tējas, ‘immortals’ etc.

2.8.7. ‘adhi-’ = āśrayatva = abhimāna = āvēśa

2.8.9. ādhibhautika and ādhidaivika as two aspects of the same entity, the two aspects as mutual reflections

2.8.10. ādhidaivika explanation for folk rituals

2.8.11. ādhidaivika explanation for Greek and Hindu polytheisms

2.8.12. ādhidaivika of ādhidaivika : Monotheism of polytheism, two puruṣas and the ‘other’ ‘superior most’ puruṣa

2.8.13. ādhidaivika as avyakta (unmanifest) creation and parā (beyond) level creation,

2.8.14. ādhidaivika as ‘energy’, ‘field’ etc. of science: theories of myth as ‘science’

2.8.15. ādhidaivika as ādisṛṣṭi (primordial creation) (in matsyapurāṇa): divya (luminescent) , tējōmaya (radiant), jñānajanya(knowledge-made), beyond naked eye perception

2.9. ādhidaivika-ādhyātmika : spirit(‘super-natural’) -level and self- experience (‘psychological’)-level (meanings of myth) 134-149 (15.5 pages)

2.9.1. . ādhidaivika is nevertheless outside the individual (intangibly objective)

2.9.3. world-wide claims of ‘seeing’ , ‘getting into the state of’, ‘getting possessed by’ ādhidaivika

2.9.4. Experience of ādhidaivika as a matter of ‘unconscious’, inside the individual, in Freud and Jung

2.9.5. ‘adhyātma’ as the term for the nature of ātman, the experiencing entity (subject) inside the individual.

2.9.6. Upanishads and the Vedanta therein as ādhyātmika’ (śārīrika the embodied, inside the body) experiencing (subjective) level understanding of myth

2.9.7. Dream analysis as the coincidental commonality between Upanishads and psychoanalysis

2.9.8. Experiencing level understanding of ritual in Upanishads and the Vedanta therein

2.9.9. The bridge between ādhidaivika and the ādyātmika in the Upanishads and the Vedanta therein

2.9.10. One (Bhakti Vedanta) view of the link: Form and content both real (Form and content of the ādhibhautika and ādhidaivika are both real, ātman experiences both)

2.9.11. Second (Advaita Vedanta) view of the link: Indistinct Content real, form with distinctions projected. (Content of the ādhibhautika and ādhidaivika are both real, ātman experiences their form as projected by itself.)

2.9.12. Dream as an analogy for projection in Advaita Vedanta and Psychoanalysis.

2.9.13. Coincidence of Child development views in depth psychology and Vedic myths

2.9.14. Difference between Advaitic projection and Jungian projection: ‘Forgetfulness’ as an archetype in Mircea Eliade

2.9.15. Projection itself is the difference between the two views of Vedanta

2.9.16. ādhyātmika interpretations of vedic and purāṇic myths should be done as per the vedic and purāṇic norms outlined here.

2.9.17. Ramacharitmanas :Theory of 'Myth is mind-lake , holy bathe in it cures'; Similarity with Jungian theory

2.9.18. 'ādhyātmika' here is a new coinage, part of the Indian myth-theory, not a religious or spiritual term.

2.9.19. ādhyātmika is avibhāga (indistinct, unconscious)

2.9.20. ādhyātmika (in the sense of psychological/unconscious) is the source of pull for myth

2.9.21. Is the ādhyātmika experience different from rasānanda ? (Issue postponed to the next chapter)

Chapter Three: Myth criticism in Indian terms: the poetics aspect

150-237 (87 pages)

3.1. purāṇa rahasyānaṁda (ecstasy of myth-meaning- revelation)150 -170(21 pages)

3.1.1. Third of the three myth-meanings involves ecstasy.

3.1.2 Affectivist myth-analyses of Freud and Jung recognise the unconscious myth-effect, Freud on the effect of Oedipus Rex

3.1.3. No name for the ecstasy , proposal of terms 'purāṇarahasyānanda' (ecstasy from the secrecy of myth) 'rahasyatādātmya' (ecstatic identification with the (myth-)secrecy)

3.1.4. Jung's description of this as 'archetypal situation'

3.1.5. Aesthetic 'Rasa' versus purāṇarahasyānanda/ rahasyatādātmya

3.1.6. 'Mana' as a quality of myth-level narratives that gives ecstasy and of the audience that can reach it.

3.1.7. Jung's theory of myth-ecstasy as innate, universal and unconscious

3.1.8. kundalinī of tantra as an innate, universal and unconscious entity; proposing that as an MERD (Myth Ecstacy Ready Device); chakras-system; 'moon' as frozen, kundalinī-triggered ecstasy

3.1.9. Methods of 'awakening' the 'device' in Yogasutras and Vakyapadiyam

3.1.10. 'rasa' of 'rasō vai sah' of Upanishads is 'sōma, the moon', 'sōma rasa' of the Vedas in its ādhyātmika form; this rasa as the myth-ecstasy, ritual-experiences such as 'getting charged', 'getting possessed' etc. as this 'rasa' ; bhakti is this rasa, not the aesthetic 'rasa'.

3.1.11. yoga-tantra-bhakti equation; yajna-yoga-temple equation; Jung's theory of therapeutic effect of temple; Jungian psychology's closeness to yoga-tantra.

3.1.12. Finding kundalinī ideas in myth in old esoteric commentaries of myth is different from kundalinī as an explanation for myth-ecstasy.

3.1.13. myth-ecstasy has a 'vēdāham' (I know now) 'eureka' feeling.

3.1.14. abhivakti theory of aesthetic rasa as a model for an abhivyakti theory of purāṇarahasyānanda/ rahasyatādātmya; Jungian explanation close to 'abhivyakti'; Epistemological commonality between the abhivyakti and Jungian models evidenced in vākyapadīyam.

3.1.15. Where is purāṇarahasyānanda/ rahasyatādātmya?; It is in the of myth-actor/ritual-participant cum myth/ritual- audience who identifies with the archetype.

3.1.16. purāṇarahasyānanda/ rahasyatādātmya is closer to Brahmānanda than aesthetic rasa which is Brahmānandasahōdara

3.1.17. . purāṇarahasyānanda/ rahasyatādātmya explanation for bhaktirasa.

3.1.18. Ecstasy discussion is greater in Indian myth-theory than in its western counterpart.

3.2. Post-natal features of purāṇakathā –evolution of myth after its primordial birth)170-173 (4 pages)

3.2.1. purāṇakathā (myth) joins other prakhyāta itivṛttas (traditional narratives), sharing their fate to an extent

3.2.2. purāṇakathā (myth) as kalpa vṛkṣa (wish-tree) : received/used and considered receivable/usable in multiple ways.

3.2.3. rasāpādana (attribution of rasa), upadēśāpādana(attribution of instruction) and miśraṇa (modifications in the narrative) the three chief post-natal features of myth

3.3. rasāpādana (attribution of rasa) to purāṇakathā (attributing aesthetic ecstasy to myth) 173-177(5 pages)

3.3.1. siddharasaprakhyāh: myths are 'known for the in-built (aesthetic) rasa'

3.3.2. Rasa gets in-built through public use

3.3.3. In-built rasa can be modified by the narrating poet

3.3.4. Difference of opininion about the angi(main) rasa of different purāṇakathās

3.3.5. Different rasa-uses of purāṇakathā in popular tradition

3.3.6. Bhaktirasa as frequently identified for purāṇakathā

3.3.7. Poet, not the myth responsible for the liberties taken during poetic narration

3.4. upadēśāpādana(attribution of instruction) to purāṇakathā (attributing moral/instruction to myth) 177-181(5 pages)

3.5. miśraṇa (modifications in the narrative) of purāṇakathā – (retelling myths with modifications)181-187(7 pages)

3.6. Attempts to 'create' purāṇakathā (attempts at mythopoesis)187-194(pages)3.7. View of purāṇakathā as tattvams (Mystic lyrics)-like communication (Esoteric view of myth) 194-201(8 pages)

3.8. View of purāṇakathā as tattvakathā (allegorical narrative) -like communication (allegorical view of myth) 201-207(7 pages)

3.9. View of purāṇakathā as chētanīkaraṇa ('animation') (viewing myth as personification /animation) 207-214(8 pages)

3.10. View of purāṇakathā as rūpaka/lakṣaṇa/ ālaṁkārika prayōga (myth as metaphor or figurative expression) 214-227(14 pages)

3.11. anumiti model of purāṇakathā(Northrop Frye's 'hypothetical nature of narratives' and its application to myth)221-227(7 pages)

3.12. "rahasyah kaavyajīvitam" (secrecy of communication is the vital essence of poetry): a new thesis. 227-237(11 pages)